

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
	)	CRIMINAL ACTION FILE
v.	)	
	)	NUMBER 1:11-cr-434-TCB
VERNANDO SEALS,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Vernando Seals's objections [69] to Magistrate Judge Vineyard's Report and Recommendation (the "R&R") [66], which recommends that Seals's motion to suppress statements [40] be denied.

A district judge has a duty to conduct a "careful and complete" review of a magistrate judge's R&R. *Williams v. Wainwright*, 681 F.2d 732, 732 (11th Cir. 1982) (quoting *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404, 408 (5th Cir. 1982)).<sup>1</sup> Where no objection to the R&R is made, it need only be reviewed for clear error. *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x 781, 784 (11th

---

<sup>1</sup> The Eleventh Circuit has adopted as binding precedent all Fifth Circuit decisions issued before October 1, 1981, as well as all decisions issued after that date by a Unit B panel of the former Fifth Circuit. *Stein v. Reynolds Sec., Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33, 34 (11th Cir. 1982); *see also United States v. Schultz*, 565 F.3d 1353, 1361 n.4 (11th Cir. 2009) (discussing continuing validity of *Nettles*).

Cir. 2006).<sup>2</sup> Where objections are made, a district judge “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district judge must “give fresh consideration to those issues to which specific objection has been made by a party.” *Jeffrey S. v. State Bd. of Educ. of Ga.*, 896 F.2d 507, 512 (11th Cir. 1990).

“Parties filing objections must specifically identify those findings objected to. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections need not be considered by the district court.” *Nettles*, 677 F.2d at 410 n.8. “This rule facilitates the opportunity for district judges to spend more time on matters actually contested and produces a result compatible with the purposes of the Magistrates Act.” *Id.* at 410.

The district judge also has discretion to decline to consider arguments that were not raised before the magistrate judge. *Williams v. McNeil*, 557

---


<sup>2</sup> *Macort* addressed only the standard of review applied to a magistrate judge’s factual findings; however, the Supreme Court has held that there is no reason for the district court to apply a different standard of review to a magistrate judge’s legal conclusions. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Thus, district courts in this circuit have routinely applied a clear-error standard to both. See *Tauber v. Barnhart*, 438 F. Supp. 2d 1366, 1373-74 (N.D. Ga. 2006) (collecting cases). By contrast, the standard of review on appeal distinguishes between the factual findings and legal conclusions. See *Monroe v. Thigpen*, 932 F.2d 1437, 1440 (11th Cir. 1991) (when magistrate judge’s findings of fact are adopted by district court without objection, they are reviewed on appeal under plain-error standard, but questions of law remain subject to *de novo* review).

F.3d 1287, 1292 (11th Cir. 2009). Indeed, a contrary rule “would effectively nullify the magistrate judge’s consideration of the matter and would not help to relieve the workload of the district court.” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Howell*, 231 F.3d 615, 622 (9th Cir. 2000)).

After conducting a complete and careful review of the R&R, the district judge may accept, reject or modify the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Williams*, 681 F.2d at 732. The district judge may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

The Court has conducted a careful review of the R&R and Seals’s objections thereto. Having done so, the Court finds that Magistrate Judge Vineyard’s factual and legal conclusions were correct and that Seals’s objections have no merit. Thus, the Court ADOPTS AS ITS ORDER the R&R [66] and DENIES Seals’s motion to suppress statements [40].

IT IS SO ORDERED this 3rd day of October, 2012.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Timothy C. Batten, Sr.", written over a horizontal line.

Timothy C. Batten, Sr.  
United States District Judge